



#4  
Brett

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Wilt et al.

Art Unit: 2624

Application No. 09/780,325

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Filed: February 9, 2001

I hereby certify that this paper and the documents referred to as being attached or enclosed herewith are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on March 21, 2003 as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

For: EFFICIENT PERCEPTUAL/PHYSICAL COLOR SPACE CONVERSION

Stephen A. Wight  
Attorney for Applicant

Examiner: Jeffery Brier

Date: March 21, 2003

**RECEIVED**

APR 18 2003

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Technology Center 2600

### **RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION**

With reference to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.111 in view of the following remarks.

### **REMARKS**

In the Action, the Office has imposed a restriction between claim groups I (claims 1-18) and II (claims 19-23). The Applicants request reconsideration of the restriction between claim groups I-II because these claims would be more appropriately searched and examined together. Applicants therefore request that claims 1-23 remain in the application in view of the following response.

The Office alleges that restriction is proper because the claim groups are distinct and have separate classifications. (Action at ¶ 3.)

As stated in MPEP § 808.02,

Where the related inventions as claimed are shown to be distinct under the criteria of MPEP § 806.05(c) - § 806.05(i), the examiner, in order to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction, must show by appropriate explanation one of the following: (A) Separate classification thereof: ... (B) A separate status in the art when they are classifiable together: ... (C) A different field of search: .... (Emphasis added.)